

Remarks

Claims 1, 5-6, 8, 10-14, 18-20 and 23-25 are pending.

Rejections Based On Suzuki

All pending claims stand rejected under Section 102 and 103 as being anticipated by Suzuki (5923013) (Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10-14 and 18-20) or obvious over Suzuki in view of Shimuzu (6052202) (Claims 22-25).

A Form Is An Image That Occurs More Than Once In A Document

Claims 1, 8, 10 and 14 each recite limitations related to processing images that occur more than once in a document according to different printing techniques, depending on which technique is indicated. For example, Claim 1 recites a means for:

(1) responding to the indicator indicating permission is granted to print each instance of the form from the same video data by processing and printing the named sequence according to a first printing algorithm; and

(2) responding to the indicator indicating each instance of the form is to be printed from new video data by processing and printing the named sequence according to a second printing algorithm.

It is well settled that an applicant may be his own lexicographer. The Examiner is obligated to apply in the claims the definition of a term specially defined by the applicant in the Specification. MPEP 2173.05(a). It necessarily follows, therefore, that the applicant does not have to repeat in the claim the definition given to a term in the Specification.

"Form" is specially defined in the Specification as an image that occurs more than once in a document. Specification, page 1, lines 17-20. Applicant, therefore, does not have to recite in the claims "a form which is an image that occurs more than once in a document." Rather, it is enough to simply recite "a form" which, by definition, means an image that occurs more than once in a document.

Suzuki Does Not Teach Processing An Image That Occurs More Than Once In A Document (All Claims)

The Office asserts incorrectly that printing a page from a document more than once means the page occurs more than once in the document. Each page occurs once in a document no matter how many times the page is printed. If the Office disagrees, it is respectfully requested to specifically *explain* those passages in Suzuki that teach the same page occurring more than once in a document. Absent such a showing, the rejection of all claims should be reversed.

Suzuki Does Not Teach Responding, Converting And Generating (Claim 8)

Claim 8 recites responding to the parameter being set to a first value by converting the named sequence (describing a form) into video data and then using the video data to print each instance of the form, and responding to the parameter being set to a second value by generating new video data to print each instance of the form.

In Suzuki, when the user specifies which saved print job is to be printed, the print programming routine checks to see whether or not the print job has already been rasterized/expanded (i.e., saved before RIP or saved after RIP). If the print job was saved after RIP, the print job is printed. If the print job was saved before RIP (i.e., not expanded), then the file is rasterized/expanded before printing. Suzuki, column 12, lines 10-27.

There is nothing in this sequence of events in Suzuki that teaches or suggests the converting and generating actions of Claim 8. Even assuming rasterizing a print job saved before rasterizing might somehow be deemed the required converting or the required generating, it cannot be both. That is to say, for a print job saved after rasterizing there is neither converting nor generating. The Office's apparent assertion to the contrary is clearly wrong. If the print job has been saved after rasterizing, there is nothing left but to print the job -- "In S208, the routine starts printing based on the job description file." Suzuki, column 12, lines 24-25. Nothing new is generated and nothing old is converted. Again, if the Office disagrees it is respectfully requested to specifically *explain* those passages in Suzuki that teach generating new video data in response to

identifying a print job that was saved after rasterizing. Absent such a showing, the rejection of Claim 8 should be reversed.

Suzuki Does Not Teach Responding, Converting And Converting (Claim 10)

Claim 10 recites responding to the parameter being set to a first value by converting the named sequence into video data and then using the video data to print each instance of the form, and responding to the parameter being set to a second value by converting the named sequence into display list data and then using the display list data to print each instance of the form.


In Suzuki, when the user specifies which saved print job is to be printed, the print programming routine checks to see whether or not the print job has already been rasterized/expanded (i.e., saved before RIP or saved after RIP). If the print job was saved after RIP, the print job is printed. If the print job was saved before RIP (i.e. not expanded), then the file is rasterized/expanded before printing. Suzuki, column 12, lines 10-27.

There is nothing in this sequence of events in Suzuki that teaches or suggests the two converting actions of Claim 10. Even assuming rasterizing a print job saved before rasterizing might somehow be deemed the first required converting or the second required converting, it cannot be both. That is to say, for a print job saved after rasterizing there is no converting. The Office's apparent assertion to the contrary is clearly wrong. If the print job has been saved after rasterizing, there is nothing left but to print the job – "In S208, the routine starts printing based on the job description file." Suzuki, column 12, lines 24-25. Nothing is converted.

The Office's reliance to S201 and S202 in Suzuki in support of the rejection is misplaced. In S201, a list of saved print jobs is displayed. In S202, the operator enters a print request for one of the print jobs displayed in S201. Neither step has any relevance at all to the claimed converting actions which occur *after* the act of receiving the named sequence and associated parameter.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Steven R. Ormiston
Reg. No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204